

DEIFICATION/HOMINIFICATION AND THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTIONS: INTERNAL CHRISTOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR RE-DATING *CENT NOMS DE DÉU*

With unanimity, previous commentators on Lullian Christology¹ have tended to draw up a dichotomous plan of Lull's evolution from adherent of the Incarnation-for-redemption thesis to supporter and proponent of a creation-for-Incarnation position. For the majority of these authors (Eijo Garay, Nicolau, De Rubí, Longpré) the decisive turning point is the work *Cent noms de Déu* which they date as being written in Rome in 1285.² In this work they see the first expression or crystallisation of Lull's views on the Primacy of Christ. This and all subsequent works with a Christological bent they see as manifesting a stark contrast with his earlier, largely soteriological, focus. However, in my view, such a reading is not sufficiently nuanced to capture the complexion of Lull's Christology, if not ultimately misleading.

What each author singularly fails to recognise, or indeed deliberately occludes, is Lull's continuing adherence to a redemptive Incarnation, not only within *Cent noms de Déu*, but also afterwards, and even in his final works.

¹ S. d'Algaida, «Cristologia lulliana seu de motivo incarnationis doctrina B. Raymundi Lull», *Colectanea Franciscana* 1 (1931), 145-83; L. Eijo Garay, «La finalidad de la encarnación según el Beato Raimundo Lulio», *Revista Española de Teología* 2 (1942), 201-27; B. Nicolau, «El primado absoluto de Cristo en el pensamiento luliano», *EL* 2 (1958), 297-312; B. de Rubí, «El Cristocentrismo de Ramón Lull», *Estudios Franciscanos* 60 (1959), 5-40; E. Longpré, «La primauté du Christ selon Raymond Lulle», *EL* 13 (1969), 5-35.

² Eijo Garay, *op. cit.*, p. 217, Rome, 1285 (see also p. 217, note 55, where he cites Longpré and Pasqual's datings of Rome, 1285. He dismisses Galmés' revised date of 1292.); Nicolau, *op. cit.*, p. 303, follows Eijo Garay in dating *Cent noms de Déu* around 1285 and as the occasion of Lull's change to a Christocentric view; de Rubí, *op. cit.*, p. 12, sees the earliest signs of Lull's Christocentrism in *Llibre d'intenció*, which he dates 1282-3; *ibid.*, p. 13, note 17, de Rubí dates *Cent noms de Déu* Rome, 1285; *ibid.*, pp. 29-30, de Rubí gives a rather improbable date of 1300-1 for *Llibre de demostracions*. See also A. Bonner, *OS II*, p. 550, n. 36.

Indeed, how could Llull not maintain such an adherence to as important an interpretation of one of the primary articles of the Catholic faith? Llull can thus be seen to uphold at all times a belief in the restorative or recreative purpose of the Incarnation, namely Christ's role in the economy of salvation. Earlier commentators have tended to conceal or chosen to ignore this continuing presence in Llull's later Christology; even going so far as to suggest in one case (Nicolau) that Llull actively seeks to deny the soteriological function of the Incarnation.³

Such observations, however, do not seek to detract from the valuable contribution such authors have made in highlighting Llull's formulation of a Christocentric position, nor to deny that he, in fact, makes such a formulation. But what my own research has revealed is that not only do these authors distort our view of Llull's Christology after *Cent noms de Déu*, but also that they omit from consideration certain intimations or the latent presence of the Primacy of Christ thesis in writings which predate this work by some years. For Llull, even in a work as early as the *Llibre de demostracions* (1274-6 Santanach), speaks of a dual purpose for the Incarnation: the manifestation of God's attributes being an intention superior to that of the recreation of man.⁴ He insists on the multiplicity of purposes of the Incarnation from the time of his very earliest works,⁵ and can be found already to make use of the doctrine of the two intentions in *Llibre de contemplació* (1273-4?) as well as in *Liber principiorum theologiae* (1274-8?) where the principles include first (Q) and second (R) intentions.⁶ It is the combination of elements in his early Christology, such as the maximal manifestation of God's attributes and love in Christ, the notion of Christ as final cause of creation – even while ostensibly emphasising His salvific work –, and the notion of Christ as the supreme created work of God, which contribute to the formation in Llull's writings of the Primacy of Christ and the exuberant expression of a hyperbolic paean to the God-man. These elements, however, are all present well before the 1280s, indeed well before *Cent noms de Déu*.

Eijo Garay has suggested that the theme of Christ as final cause of creation is common to both the period before and after *Cent noms de Déu*, and concludes therefore that this concept is not specific to the Primacy of Christ thesis.⁷ Bonnefoy, however, has argued, convincingly I believe, that adherence to the notion of Christ as final cause is, on its own, a sufficient condition for the Primacy of

³ Nicolau, *op. cit.*, p. 303, states that after 1285/*Cent noms de Déu*, the concept of Incarnation-for-redemption appears no more and that Llull even adduces arguments against this idea.

⁴ ORL XV, pp. 23 and 595.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 531-2.

⁶ 337:11 (ORL VIII, p. 265); prologue to *Liber principiorum theologiae*, MOG I, ix, 1-2 (607-8).

⁷ Eijo Garay, *op. cit.*, p. 210, states that Llull's doctrine of Christ as the end of the universe is common to both theories of the final cause of the Incarnation and so does not affect the evolution of his doctrine.

Christ thesis.⁸ I would therefore suggest that Llull's support for the Primacy of Christ thesis can be dated as early as 1274-83, the date Santanach gives for *Llibre del gentil e dels tres savis*, a work in which Llull espouses the notion of Christ as final cause.⁹

In fact, my criticism of earlier Lullian commentators goes so far as to question the very primacy and importance they attach to *Cent noms de Déu*, as well as to question the date of 1285 they attribute to this work and, with revision, the more commonly accepted date of 1288? (Bonner). In my view, this work though not central in Christological terms, is important for its introduction of terminology such as deification and hominification with regard to the hypostatic union. Such a feature seems to suggest a far later date for the work, since such terminology can only be found in Llull's writings of the early- to mid-1290s and later.

The first occasion the vocabulary of deification is used is *Compendium Artis demonstrativae* (1288-9)¹⁰ where it emerges via the expression of the passive and active correlatives of *deificare*, viz. *deificabilis* and *deificativus*. It is thus introduced in the context of the development of the correlative theory concerning the operations of deity, and designates, first, his internal operations as Father (*deificativus*) and Son (*deificabilem*), and is then extended to include God's external influence upon creation, particularly upon man, such that from these internal and external likenesses should be made a God-man, without which unified being creatures would be more *deificabilis* in God than God *deificativus* in creatures. Llull also refers at this stage to the complementary concept of an homificate (*homificatus*).

There are many more examples of Llull's use of the paired and complementary terminology of deification/hominification – in verbal form – in *Cent noms de Déu*.¹¹ In three of the instances the pair of terms is used together, in another three «deification» or its cognates is used alone, and on a single occasion «hominification» is used separately. Further, in Chapter 40, § 2, p. 116, the infinitive, *deificar*, used on its own, is said to be the first intention of creation.

⁸ J.-F. Bonnefoy, «Il primato di Cristo nella teologia contemporanea», in *Problemi e orientamenti di teologia dommatica* ed. C. Marzorati (Milan: Pontificia Facoltà Teologica di Milano, 1957), pp. 122-235, especially pp. 128-31. See also D. Unger, «Absolute and Universal Primacy of Christ», *Franciscan Studies* 2 (1942), pp. 428-75, especially pp. 441-61, 471. Bonnefoy identifies the Primacy of Christ thesis with the statement of Christ as (secondary) final, (secondary) efficient and (secondary) exemplary cause; Unger with the statement of Christ as universal *finis*, universal exemplar, and universal mediator of all creation. However, for Unger, these elements of Christ's absolute Primacy are subordinate to the primary end of Christ, namely His being predestined first and absolutely for His own sake.

⁹ OS I, p. 224.

¹⁰ MOG III, vi, 77-78 (367-8).

¹¹ ORL XIX, pp. 101, 110, 111, 115, 116, 136, and 149.

Such terminology, apart from these instances, is used largely between 1294-99, starting with *Disputació de cinc savis* in which Llull alters slightly the thrust of his argument to insist now that God's becoming man is the first intention of the Incarnation, and man's becoming God its second intention, redemption itself being subordinate to the latter of these.¹² Llull states:

Dix lo latí: «La fi per què és encarnació és per so que Déus sia home, e aquesta és la primera entenció e la pus principal per què Déus és encarnat. E la segona entenció és per so que home sia Déu, e aquesta segona entenció és primera segons comparatió de la redemptió del human gendre, la qual redemptió és per la segona entenció.

Llull continues to favour the divine end of the Incarnation (i.e. *per so que Déus sia home*) with respect to its human counterpart (i.e. *per so que home sia Déus*) in Part III, *De octava racione*, p. 92, and makes further references to deification/hominification¹³ and to the fittingness of Christ's being deifiable (*deificabile*).¹⁴ The added terminological complexity and the hierarchisation of hominification over deification specific to this work indicates that it was composed a certain time after *Cent noms de Déu*.

Lectura Artis inventiva et Tabulam generalem (1294-5?) is also a work rich in references to deification and hominification and their correlatives which thus describe God's active and passive assumption of humanity via the Incarnation.¹⁵ A further reference to *deificar* can also be found as late as *Dictat de Ramon* (1299), here emphasising the superiority of deification over creation.¹⁶

From this evidence it is apparent that the terminology of deification/hominification is tentatively introduced at the time of *Compendium Artis demonstrativae* 1288-9 (the *terminus a quo* of *Cent noms de Déu*) and reaches a significant degree of sophistication and subtlety by the time of *Lectura super Artem inventivam et Tabulam generalem* (1294-5?) (the *terminus ad quem* of *Cent noms de Déu*). The large proportion of references, however, with the exception of those in *Cent noms de Déu* itself, occur after this point.

The date proposed by Galmés¹⁷ would thus seem to be the most plausible, that is 1292, which would place *Cent noms de Déu* much closer to its sister work and reformulation, after *Proverbis de Ramon* (1296? Bonner), and might also suggest that Llull composed this work immediately prior to his first trip to

¹² ATCA 5 (1986), p. 75.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 159-160.

¹⁵ MOG V, v, pp. 156-7 (514-5). Tertia quaestio D, §§ 3, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20; pp. 157-8 (515-6). Quarta quaestio E, §§ 1, 4, 8, 9, 14; and p. 168, Decima quaestio K.

¹⁶ ORL XIX, p. 269.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. xxvii-xxxii.

Tunis (1293) in an effort to imitate and supersede the Koran. Galmés confirms in his article the place of composition as being Rome on the grounds of the exhortation in the Prologue of *Cent noms de Déu* «al sant Payre apostolic e als senyors cardinals que l fassen posar en latí en bel dictat» as if these were present.¹⁸ He also cites Llull's use of his own name in the Prologue as a feature uncharacteristic of the 1280s, Llull generally preferring to use a term such as *peccator indignus*. He further adduces Llull's pessimism in *Cent noms de Déu* regarding the response of highly placed church dignitaries to his missionary projects as evidence that this is not a work of the 1280s, reaching the interim conclusion that this work should be dated in the first years of the 1290s, and settling finally, for further biographical reasons, on a date in the latter part of 1292.¹⁹ Also, it would seem unlikely, to say the least, that Llull would wait almost ten years before reworking *Cent noms de Déu*. The fact that this work is also heavily soteriological does not necessarily suggest a much earlier date, but in fact reinforces the evidence that Llull continues to endorse a redemptive Incarnation throughout his writing career.

My research thus far has aimed to replace the dichotomous paradigm of earlier authors with a dialectical model: that is to say, I have attempted to show, in Llull's writings on Christ, the presence of an emerging dialectic (and a dialectic which emerges very early on at that) between the Incarnation-for-redemption and the creation-for-Incarnation theses. For Llull, it would appear, it is never a disjunctive moment; both positions can co-exist and interact. While he may be found to prioritise the redemptive position in his earliest works (*Llibre de contemplació* for example), the statement of such a position always bears witness to its competing response. This is true not only of his works before the mid-1280s but also of those which prioritise the Primacy of Christ over redemption after this time. Llull maintains this active tension through the relativising influence of the doctrine of intentions; at first giving priority to the redemptive thesis and later reversing this to give ascendancy to the Primacy of Christ.

It is on the basis of this approach and the internal evidence it has revealed, that I would tentatively suggest a revised date for *Cent noms de Déu* (1292?).

Robert Hughes,
Lancaster University,
United Kingdom

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xxx.